IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition No. 156 of 2006 (S/B)

Dr. Vijay Laxmi W/o Sri Sudhir Kumar Sharma,
In Front of Little India School,
District Dehradun. ……. Petitioner

Versus

1. Union of India through Secretary,
   Ministry of Public Grievances & Pension Cell,
   3rd Floor, Lok Nayak Bhawan,
   Khan Market, New Delhi.
2. State of Uttaranchal through Principal Secretary,
   Finance cum Secretariat, Dehradun.
3. Director of Treasury & Financial Services,
   23 Lakhi Road, State of Uttaranchal
   Dehradun.
4. State of U.P. through Secretary,
   Local Funds Accounts & Audit Department,
   Lucknow.
5. Director, Local Funds,
   U.P. Allahabad.
6. Bhairav Dutt Tiwari,
   Joint Director, Samvarit Sampariksha,
   Sthaniya Nidhi, Lekha Pariksha,
   H.N. Bahuguna University,
   Srinagar (Garhwal).
7. Virendra Mohan Uniyal,
   Mandi Parishad, U.P. Lucknow.
8. Vipin Chandra Joshi,
   Office Zila Lekha Pariksha Adhikari,
   Sthaniya Nidhi, Lekha Pariksha, Prabhag
   Udham Singh Nagar.
9. Chandra Shekhar Mektolia,
   Office Zila Lekha Pariksha Adhikari,
   Sthaniya Nidhi, Lekha Pariksha, Prabhag,
   Nainital.
10. Navin Chandra Pandey,
    Officer Zila Lekha Pariksha Adhikari,
    Sthaniya Nidhi, Lekha Pariksha, Prabhag,
    Almora. …….. Respondents

Mr. M. C. Pant, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Arvind Vashishth, Assistant Solicitor General for respondent No. 1.
Mr. Nanak Chand Gupta, Standing Counsel for respondents Nos. 2 and 3.
Ms. Beena Pandey, Standing Counsel (U.P. Govt.) for respondents Nos. 4 & 5.
None for respondents Nos. 6 to 10.

JUDGMENT

Coram: Hon'ble Rajeev Gupta, C.J.
Hon'ble Rajesh Tandon, J.

RAJEEV GUPTA, C.J. (Oral)

Mr. M. C. Pant, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Arvind Vashishth, Assistant Solicitor General for respondent No. 1.

Mr. Nanak Chand Gupta, Standing Counsel for respondents Nos. 2 and 3.

Ms. Beena Pandey, Standing Counsel (U.P. Govt.) for respondents Nos. 4 & 5.

None for respondents Nos. 6 to 10.

2. Mr. M.C. Pant, the learned counsel for the petitioner, in view of the development that the petitioner during the pendency of the writ petition has been promoted on the post of Senior Auditor, Grade I, seeks permission to withdraw the writ petition with the liberty of filing another writ petition for the redressal of the petitioner's surviving grievances.

3. Permission granted.

4. With the above liberty, the writ petition is dismissed as withdrawn.

(Rajesh Tandon, J.) 20.09.2006

(Rajeev Gupta, C.J.) 20.09.2006

G